

### **ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action mailed March 27, 2007 has been carefully considered in the Office Action. Claims 2-5, 7-15 and 17-19 stand rejected. In addition, Claims 2, 4, 5 and 15 have been objected to. Further, Claims 20 and 21 have been allowed. The Applicant has cancelled Claims 2, 17 and 18 and has amended Claims 3-5, 7, 8, 19-21. The Applicant reserves the right to pursue all canceled claims in continuation and/or divisional applications. In addition, the Applicant has added new Claim 22. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

#### **Drawings**

The drawings of the present application have been objected to in the Office Action under 37 CFR 1.83(a). In particular, it is stated in the office action that horizontal axis must be shown in the figures. The Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 19 has been amended to clarify that the horizontal axis of the load bearing structure is a first horizontal axis and the horizontal axis of the suspended structure is a second horizontal axis. The amended subject matter recited in Claim 19 is fully supported by the Figures as they currently stand and the Figures therefore do not need to be amended. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

#### **Informal Objections**

Within the Office Action, several objections were made to the claims regarding minor spelling and typographical errors. Applicant has amended Claims 19-21 to correct these errors without affecting the scope and meaning of the claimed subject matter and respectfully request that the objections be withdrawn in light of the amendments.

Rejections under 35 USC 112

Within the Office Action Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 14, 15, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 USC. § 112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph as being indefinite for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. The Applicant has cancelled Claims 2, 17 and 18 and thus the rejections to these claims are now moot. The Applicant has amended Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 14 and 15 to bring them in conformity with the language in Claim 19 and submits the rejections have now been overcome. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 USC 102

Claims 3, 7-11, 14 and 17-19 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by US Patent 5,779,260 to Reilly et al. (hereinafter "Reilly"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. However, to expedite prosecution of this application, Claim 19 has been amended to include the claimed subject matter in objected-to dependent Claim 2, which now has been cancelled. Accordingly, the rejection is now moot and should be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 7-11, and 14 are all dependent on Claim 19. Considering that amended Claim 19 is allowable, Claims 3, 7-11 and 14 are all allowable for being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Reilly in view of U.S. Patent 3,526,413 to Muller. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

However, as stated above, Claim 19 is allowable as discussed above. Accordingly, Claims 12 and 13 are allowable for being dependent on an allowable base claim.

New Claim

The Applicant has added new Claim 22, whereby Claim 22 incorporates the limitations in dependent Claims 3 and 4. The Applicant submits that new Claim 22 is fully supported by the specification and does not contain any new matter. Allowance of Claim 22 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

It is believed that this response places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of the application is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Dated:

9/5/07

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Bhattacharya', written over a horizontal line.

Suvashis Bhattacharya  
Reg. No. 46,554

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP  
P.O. Box 640640  
San Jose, CA 95164-0640  
Tel. (408) 292-5800  
Fax. (408) 287-8040